DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 070 438 JC 730 011

TITLE [A Program to Prepare College and University Officials to Increase the Enrollment and Meet the Needs of Minority Groups and Low Income Students. General Summary and Recommendations.]

INSTITUTION California Community Colleges, Sacramento. Office of the Chancellor.; Mills Coll., Oakland, Calif.; Wright State Univ., Dayton, Ohio.

PUB DATE [70]

NOTE 16p.; Program No. 45-5631

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29

DESCRIPTORS *Administrative Personnel; Administrator Attitudes; College Students; *Community Colleges; *Disadvantaged Youth; Educational Change; Educational Opportunities; Educational Programs; *Low Income Groups; *Minority Groups; Post Secondary Education; Program Descriptions; Program Evaluation; Socioeconomic Status; Student College Relationship

ABSTRACT

A training program was held for academic administrators of community colleges in order to develop the skills and awareness required to meet the needs of low-income minority-group students. Each participating institution was expected to send that person responsible for the institution's efforts to meet the needs of the specified group of students, three administrative people, and one student representative of the student group concerned. The Community college program began with 5-day training session presented by a training team that toured California Community Colleges. The program used books, tapes, pamphlets, unpublished interviews and talks, direct observation of programs and program target areas, group and small group discussions, and work sessions. Evaluations are given of a President's Conference held prior to the community college training program, four five-week sessions conducted at the Wright Institute, and the program in the Community Colleges in California. Recommendations are made for improvements in future training programs. (KM)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED 070438

TRAINING PROGRAM FOR CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE PERSONNEL TO MEET THE NEEDS OF LOW-INCOME, MINORITY STUDENTS

SPONSORED BY

THE WRIGHT INSTITUTE
of
Berkeley, California

and the

CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES
of
Sacramento, California

GENERAL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

JC 730 011

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

JAN 19 1973

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

DIRECTOR'S EVALUATION REPORT

I. BASIC INFORMATION

A. The Wright Institute
2728 Durant Avenue
Berkeley, California 94704

Mills College
Oakland, California

B. A Program To Prepare College and University Officials To Increase The Enrollment and Meet the Needs of Minority Groups And Low Income Students

Program # 45-5631

C. Bill Somerville, Director
The Wright Institute
2728 Durant Avenue
Berkeley, California 94704 (415) 841-9230

C. Douglas Barker, Co-director

Involved in the program, the staff of the Wright Institute, including Nevitt Sanford, Joseph Katz, Edward Opton, and Jean Wirth. Also involved were large numbers of consultants listed in appendix A.

D. April 1, 1969 - May 30, 1970

II. PROGRAM FOCUS

Low-income students and students of color have been seeking to participate in higher education in order to relate their educational experiences to their particular environment. The training program was designed to develop the skills and awareness needed by academic administrators to meet the challenges presented by these students. More specifically, program objectives included:

1. Aiding program directors in becoming aware of as many kinds of programs for low-income minority youth as possible through research, direct observation, and participation in model programs. More specifically:

   a. To make available to directors of programs all materials on existing programs: written reports, studies, taped interviews, discussions with program directors, etc.
   b. To make available on-site visits to programs which are successful, have been successful, are no longer successful, or were never successful.
   c. To bring program directors into direct contact with large numbers of students served by programs for low-income minority students.
   d. To create an internship of one to two weeks in an institution and program with structure, goals, and program needs similar to those of the participant's institution and program.

e. To evaluate the work of the director-trainee in his work with a program as an intern, specifically observing his relationships with students, administrators, community, and his awareness of the ways in which the program is or is not successful.

2. Initiating dialogue wherever possible among program directors, other administrative personnel, and students toward all participants understanding the concerns of the students and the institution's ability or inability to confront these concerns.

3. Working with program directors to alter the attitudes of administrators directly in contact with the program so that program and director and administrators may have common goals and concerns.

4. Creating in all participants: students, directors, and other administrators an awareness of the history of programs for low-income minority students, the current status of such programs, and the probable future of programs including speculation on and planning for the day when special programs for low-income minority youth will no longer be needed.

5. Acquainting program directors with the information they need to have access to decision makers on their own campus, access to funding sources, local, state, and national. In rare cases where the program director was not a member of the group to be served, aiding the director in having access to the community to be served.

6. Creating an awareness on the part of all participants of the need for institutional change to meet the needs of low-income minority youth and increasing the participants' understanding of how institutional change takes place.

The relative importance of these objectives depended entirely on the staff's evaluation of the participant's awareness and needs and upon a working out of that evaluation with the participant to agree with his own stated awareness and needs. In all but one case the program's directors were either of color or had an excellent awareness of the problems of institutions in meeting the needs of a new student body. Frequently the program director needed and requested information but joined the Wright Institute staff as a trainer in helping to modify the attitudes of administrators at his own institution. The objectives of the training program then can be ranked only in terms of individual institutions.

III. PROGRAM OPERATION

Introduction

It was the aim of the program to involve as many and as varied a group of institutions in the training throughout the year. Toward that end the program began with a mailing to all institutions in the nation with enrollment of over 2,000 and to a select number of smaller institutions which seemed important because of their location, their student body, or their stated interest in dealing with the problems of the program. While waiting for responses to these mailings, the program staff involved itself in contacting nearby institutions for internship placements, gathering studies, reports, tapes, consultants, newspaper clippings, any and all information on existing programs. In addition, to attempt to get a high level commitment to the program, the training staff in cooperation with the Wright Institute, Mills College, University of California at Berkeley, Stanford University and CEEB sponsored a 5-day President's Conference at Mills College. No federal funds were used for this conference.

The timing of the conference for presidents, though excellent for the purposes of the training program (just in time to initiate interest on the part of the presidents for the participation of their administrative staff in future training programs), was ill timed for the presidents themselves. It had been a particularly stressful year for most college presidents. Many had been through real turmoil on their campuses and after commencement chose to retreat to mountains or beach and not to discussions of what had happened on their campuses or what might have happened. Many asked for summaries but frankly stated that they psychologically could not stand further consideration of this most important topic. Those who did participate tended to be presidents of colleges not yet in turmoil. A list of participants, a conference schedule, and the final press release are included in Appendix A .

At the conclusion of the President's Conference, the newly formed Chancellor's Office of the State of California Community College system approached the training staff and requested a training session devoted exclusively to community colleges. Their need was immediate. California Senate Bill 164 which provided $3,000,000 for use in programs for the disadvantaged in California has just passed and community colleges had a matter of months to plan programs for the application for and use of these monies. Only one institution had at this early date applied for admission to the first training session; a telephone call determined that that institution would be willing to change dates. A further telephone call to EPDA determined that the National nature of the training program would not be violated by one statewide effort, particularly one involving so many institutions.

The format for the community college training program was a condensation of the 5 week sessions throughout the year. Each session lasting 5 days was a miniature of the five week sessions with the internship omitted.

The training team toured instead of bringing the community college personnel to the Institute. Appendix A includes participants and schedules for those sessions. The Chancellor's office contributed $4,000 to the increased cost of the sessions based on the extra financial needs for handling so many trainees in such a short period of time. An extensive report of this session has been forwarded to the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office. The summary only is included in Appendix A .

Since both the President's Conference and the training session for California Community College personnel were out of the planned scope of the training program, funded entirely or partially by other resources, and evaluated separately, they will be excluded from sections A, B, C, and D of Part III Program Operation. The rest of this section concerns itself with the four five-week sessions conducted at the Wright Institute.

A. PARTICIPANTS

The staff of the Wright Institute considered and still considers the objectives of the training program to be top priority for institutions of higher education. Believing in that priority, the training program asked for a commitment of staff time and resources by all participating institutions. The commitment was for transportation and the full time participation of one person for five weeks and three administrative persons for one full week. Applicant response rarely reflected that kind of commitment. Many applicants requested a modified shorter session, a reduction in the number of participants, a sharing of the cost of transportation for the required student participant. Several institutions made requests to send lower level personnel. One lied about the positions held by the participants, stating on the application form that the directors of admissions and financial aid were coming when in fact they sent graduate student assistants in those offices. Out of the hundreds of schools contacted only thirty-five responded. The response of institutions was most disappointing. On the other hand and in some ways equally disappointing was the large response from agencies serving low-income and minority students. These agencies received no brochure and were in no way contacted by the Wright Institute. They received all information through contacts with institutions of higher education. They applied in large numbers and were with one exception turned down because the program was not suited to their needs. Their question was how do we make institutions respond to the needs of our students. Our question was the same.

1. SELECTION CRITERIA:

a. standardized test scores	not utilized
b. academic attainment	not utilized
c. current position	required*
d. age	not utilized
e. recommendations	required*
f. degrees	not utilized
g. interview	not utilized
h. geographic limitations	preferred
i. need and commitment	required*

The training program required a team from each institution including that person responsible for the efforts of the institution toward meeting the needs of low-income minority students (generally a program director or assistant to the president), three administrative personnel connected with the program for students in areas reflecting counseling, admissions, financial aid, student services, and curriculum, and one student of the group to be served (required that that student have one full year at the institution following participation in the program). The positions of the participants were therefore the primary requirement for selection. Recommendations depended upon the institution's assertion that these were in fact those persons who would most directly affect the lives of low-income minority students. And finally, institutions having an excellent reputation for changing and meeting the needs of students were discouraged from participation in other than a consultant role.

Where institutions made a genuine commitment of staff, the selection criteria were excellent. When institutions lied or refused commitment, neither the criteria nor the training were effective. We would not modify selection criteria. We have no suggestion for keeping institutions from lying. We would, however, require that more than one student participate and would suggest that the program cover the cost of the students. One student is at a distinct disadvantage in being a lone representative among administrators.

2. Each program director was assigned to a full time staff member who concerned himself specifically with the needs of the participant and his institution. Where participant needs were similar, staff coordinated their efforts so that participants spent time alone with a staff member and spent time with other participants and a number of staff members. The staff of the Wright Institute was available as needed for the specific concerns of individual institutions. For example, the University of New Hampshire although assigned to one member of the program staff expressed considerable interest in new approaches to curriculum and innovations in institutional design. For that reason, the participants from the University of New Hampshire spent a great deal of time with Nevitt Sanford and with the model of Johnston College.

B. STAFF

The program depended upon a combination of a close and continuing relationship with the staff of the Wright Institute and a steady supply of student, faculty, community, and administrative consultants both at the Institute and in their own areas. Only about one half of the time was spent at the Institute so that participants had opportunities to talk with other program directors, with students, with community leaders, parents, and with people in positions similar to or related to theirs.

C. ACTIVITIES

1. None of the techniques, materials or equipment of the training program was new. The program used books, tapes, pamphlets, unpublished interviews and talks; direct observation of programs and program target areas; group and small group discussions and work sessions including staff and participants, students and participants, and consultants and participants. Although most difficult to initiate, participants responded later most favorable to work sessions constructed around the specific formulation of a plan for defining, implementing, staffing, funding, and evaluating a program for their own institution. The training program required a final document from each 5 week participant, and staff were involved as much as the participant wished in aiding in the completion of that document. In some cases the document took the form of an application for funding under a number of Office of Education programs. In other cases the document took the form of a specific report to the president or chancellor of the institution for a commitment by that institution. Participants much distracted by the wealth of material and personnel around them had to be badgered into work sessions. When they agreed, the results were excellent. For example, Jaddy Blake of Wichita State University produced a document for the use of his institution and a complete Special Services Proposal. His institution adopted most of his proposal and his Special Services Proposal was funded at $100,000. Where participants refused to be involved in work sessions, the results are not so clear. For example, the participants from the University of New Hampshire were eager to spend all of their time observing California programs and institutions. They refused work sessions. They also refused group sessions with all of the members of the team participating in forming plans for the institution. The results may have been personally rewarding, but in follow up, we have no evidence of a change or a program for the University of New Hampshire. Our follow up with the Office of Education indicates that they were the only institution involved in the training which did not submit an application under student special services.

On the other hand, the University of New Hampshire is probably the best illustration of use of resources to work on changing attitudes. The University located in an area with a large population of poor whites has concentrated on importing Black students from Chicago and New York. The black student from New Hampshire and many consultants to the program agreed that this response indicated a refusal to meet a problem directly and an attempt to seem responsive through a very safe and limited approach to a changing population. Les La Fond in charge of programs for poor white students was, therefore, sent to Pippa Passas Kentucky for an internship at Alice Lloyd College where he spent one week dealing with the kinds of things Alice Lloyd has so successfully done with poor white students. John Egerton of the Southern Education Reporting Service then spent part of a weekend with the team discussing the need for commitment to students in one's immediate area and, specifically in New Hampshire, to poor white students largely of French Canadian descent.

2. No date is right for important administrators to be away from campus. On the other hand, it is difficult for administrators to involve themselves round the clock on their own campuses. We would, if we were to continue, modify the original plan to one which included time spent by the staff of the Institute on the participant's campus, and time spent by the administrators in concentrated sessions at the Institute. This we believe would not only improve the timing for the participating institutions but would also improve the staff's understanding of the problems of the institutions by allowing them interviews with a wide variety of staff and students.

3. In addition to the individual responses cited in 1 above, the staff was troubled by the lack of time participants had for listening to tapes, reading materials, and poring over the extensive files prepared by the training staff. On the whole, participants were much more interested in face to face contacts with people doing similar work. They showed a marked disinterest in reading studies and reports or even in studying guidelines for funding. Only one appeared to be interested in any research results. Since the staff of the Institute can in no way influence the hiring of special program staff at participating institutions, the only remedy the staff found was to present summaries of materials in discussions. In short, we were forced to lecture when individual study might have been more effective.

   On the other hand, we believe that the clear need expressed by the participants to meet and get to know people doing similar work indicates a strength of the training program. Participants wanted to know that they belonged to a group of people working with the same problems, the same goals. They were delighted to meet as many program directors as possible. They requested and were given rosters of names and addresses of people they could contact when they had questions. Their concern was like the precursor to the forming of a professional organization.

4. Five week participants were particularly involved in the structuring of the fourth week of the program. They analyzed the participants who were coming, their attitudes, strengths, weaknesses, and needs and with the staff of the Institute developed the program for that week. In most instances the staff of the Institute agreed with their evaluation and worked cooperatively with them in training the other administrators. One week participants arrived at an already structured program and participated only in decisions about the amount of time spent in discussion and in work sessions.

D. EVALUATION

Genuine success or failure of the Wright Institute Program can be determined only by an extensive review of the practices of those institutions involved in the program after a period of four to five years to determine whether the low-income minority enrollment and the number graduating and going on to jobs and professional schools has indeed increased. Unfortunately, that kind of evaluation will not take place and even if it were to take place would not be very instructive unless it were to include an examination of what other influences on the institution took part in the change.

It is possible, however, to point to some immediate results of the program determined in follow-up with individual institutions. These will be discussed in Conclusions.

The staff of the Wright Institute had hoped if refunded to be able to provide follow up visits for participants of the first year both in Institute staff traveling to the individual institutions to see what had, in fact, occurred, and in bringing the entire group of trainees back to the Institute for a brief session. It is our hope that something of that kind can be arranged through an on-going program.

Even more important, the Institute had planned to reinforce the learning that took place by putting together a large collection of the transcribed taped talks of the consultants from all of the sessions. Many participants requested this information and found their notes inadequate. Unfortunately, an extension to complete this document was not granted and the transcribed tapes have not been edited and run off because the staff worked up to the last minute in follow-up work with institutions.

The individual evaluations (Participant Evaluation Form GSA DC 70-3138) are included in the Appendix. The Institute relied on the many letters and telephone calls from participants for its own evaluation. For example, Doug Barker and Jaddy Blake are in steady communication by phone; Jean Wirth has been working on an evaluation of English tests for Merritt Norvell in connection with some modifications of the English program for Black students at the University of Wisconsin.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

The Wright Institute Training Program for Higher Education Personnel to meet the needs of low-income minority youth was designed to change an entire institutions, even groups of institutions, in five weeks. It was conceived as reaching all participants in making education possible for those previously excluded from education except in token numbers and working with those participants round the clock to insure their attitudinal change, their coming together into a cohesive working unit, and their learning techniques and skills for implementing their goals when they returned to their campuses.

That most ambitious goal failed for a number of reasons, some of which had to do with assuming that institutions wanted to change, some of which had to do with bad planning, and some with lack of resources for such a major task. But in failing to meet the ultimate objectives of the program, the program staff did reach some people in some very significant ways which we believe to be encouraging.

The President's Conference. The conference and the resulting press releases began a dialogue around the nation which has resulted in influencing Nevitt Sanford to develop many of his ideas on regional ethnic study centers. Those ideas were presented to the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges and to numbers of other groups. We can only sssume from the correspondence that these talks have initiated a great deal of questioning and some real attempts to modify thinking at a number of institutions.

Community Colleges In California. California Community Colleges with open enrollment have been looked to as the solution for the State of California to educating the many, many people who clamor for education. They admit that they have not done the job. Their finest spokesmen say that they have revolving doors rather than open doors, and the drop-out, flunk-out rate in community colleges is frequently as high as 60%. In spite of this, very little effort has been made by junior colleges to change to institutions which indeed meet the needs of their student body. Generally the excuse, and a real one, is lack of resources. At the same time, little has been done to develop resources. The training session with the Community Colleges spent time on the development of resources--on changing attitudes of those community college personnel who believe that there is no reason to attempt to develop resources because the more prestigious Universities and State Colleges will always eat up the resources. The change in the number of California Community Colleges which applied for EPDA money is illustrative of some success in changing attitudes. It is our belief that the process of developing grant proposals initiates self study and forces beginning commitment. We encouraged all institutions to apply under as many funding sources as possible. All but one institution applied for Student Special Services money; many applied for Talent Search. All increased their financial aid to students' requests and sought money outside the Federal government.

The Wright Institute training team returned from their sessions throughout the state with a number of impressions which we feel are important to report here. The California Community Colleges are the largest system of higher education in the world. They are being called on to take the greatest share of the responsibility for educating low-income and minority youth. They are by nature of their cost and their flexibility the institutions looked on to assume this responsibility. On the other hand, we saw little or no sense of urgency among communtiy college personnel in assuming this responsibility; we saw little active preparation for the assuming of the assigned task; we even met some who felt there was no task. This we would argue is a collision course between public expectations and college preparations.

If poor people and peoples of color are to be told by the legislature, by four-year institutions and by their high school counselors that the community college is their primary chance for an education, and if the community colleges are not prepared to meet that responsibility, we fear for all people concerned. Senate Bill 164 and the $3,000,000 it carries with it is indeed an excellent beginning for the State to move ahead with a state-wide plan for those who have previously been excluded from higher education. Such a plan must take into consideration why poor people and people of color have been excluded. And it must recognize that certain changes are essential in the excluding institutions to include and serve a new and different student body.

To be more specific about our concerns, we were aware of a pervading feeling of impotence among community college faculty and administration. That feeling of impotence, which took the form of "nobody funds J.C.'s," "We have no influence with the state legislature," "We've never had enough money, and we aren't going to have enough," and "There's no point in talking about anything that's been done at a State College or University, because we don't have their freedom," becomes a self-fulfilling prophesy. We were particularly aware of defeatism on the days we talked about sources of funding and ways of influencing legislation. Repeatedly, the evidence that J.C.'s could not be funded was a single rejection of a single proposal from one funding source. Not one institution indicated that it was the job of the institution to sell the proposal over and over again. Only one institution reported pushing a financial aids application to the appeal level. All admitted that they had in the past asked for less money than they needed in Federal Financial Aid.

Of even greater concern to us was the sensitivity and defensiveness which resists change. For example, in response to a quote from the Southern Education Reporting Service about the small numbers of Black students in higher education, we got "No one on our staff is prejudiced" or "Ours is not a racist institution." Statements were perceived as accusations where no accusations had meen made or intended. In other cases, participants were passive. They had been sent; they would stay a few hours and then leave for home. Passivity also took the form of several participants asking for ponies for proposals so they could be sure of a good proposal. In other words, there was little evidence of any creative thinking or desire for such in meeting the demands now being felt by the Junior College.

On the other hand, students throughout the State, selected by other students, came for the full five days, took copious notes, worked afternoons and evenings formulating proposals, have kept in touch with us asking for news on new legislation, and generally, paid or unpaid (only two students from each institution could be paid), made the kind of commitment that could bring about change and represent a marvelous resource to a JC for moving ahead. Students clearly are ready to work very hard to see to it that educational institutions begin to include low-income, minority students.

Because three million dollars must serve as a spur to action, and because three million split 92 ways will be highly ineffectual, we make a number of recommendations based on our experience with several community colleges.

1. That special consideration be given to those colleges which demonstrated their concern by participating with a full team throughout the training sessions, specifically, Fresno City College, San Jose City College, Chaffey, Pasadena City College, Los Angeles City College, Mt. San Antonio Junior College, and Grossmont. President McCully of Fresno City College attended throughout. Presidents were also in attendance from Mt. San Antonio, San Diego and Modesto. There are obvious exceptions to this special consideration: Diablo Valley College and Monterey Peninsula both elected a longer, 5 week training session at the Wright Institute; the Chancellor's office must be aware of other institutions with excellent reasons for not participating and with demonstrable commitment -- we know of Merritt and Santa Barbara.

2. That the activity of a single week is not sufficient to influence real change, and that follow-up activities must be planned which are based (as these sessions were not) on the joint commitment of the Chancellor's office and the participating institutions. Institutions must be willing to involve key personnel in large numbers for a specified amount of time.

3. That all participants be commited to change, and that those who are not willing to see change should not participate. Sessions can impart a certain amount of factual knowledge, i.e. what can be funded through SB 164 or Title IV, what schools throughout the nation have done to develop ethnic studies programs, what legislation applies to community colleges, what the Chicano population of the State is; but the bulk of any session must be devoted not to universals, but the creating an awareness and a willingness to experiment in change and a willingness to meet new challenges.

4. That all participants be ready to interact with students and to listen to the concerns of students about the need for change. Fresno City College and Pasadena City College were excellent examples of institutions which rely heavily on student-administration interaction.

5. That Community Colleges be encouraged to cooperate, to form consortia for the effective use of funds under National programs. 92 separate institutions will not be funded in California under any Office of Education Title. Five consortia might well be funded particularly if the Community Colleges use their excellent network of communication to set priorities, i.e. a program for Native Americans in the San Diego Area, a program for Chicanos in the Valley, a program for Asians in the Bay Area, a center for Black studies in Los Angeles.

6. That the Chancellor's office exercise all of its influence and all of its discretion in awarding funds to instigate the change so desparately being called for, and to reward those institutions which demonstrate the strongest commitment to change.

7. That the Wright Institute if called on again, be willing to:

   a. Much more effectively resist the appeal from institutions to tell them the answers and plan a program for them.

   b. Insist that no institution participate unless it participates fully.

   c. Plan a program which centers its activities on institutional dialogue of the kind that occurred only at Fresno City College.

   d. Serve solely as resource persons and facilitators, and not as lecturers.

California Community Colleges
825 Fifteenth Street
Sacramento, California 95814

CHANCELLOR'S MEMO NO. 70-16

July 29, 1969

TO: Community College Superintendents and Presidents

FROM: Sidney W. Brossman

SUBJECT: Training Programs for California Community College Personnel to Plan, Implement, Operate, and Evaluate Programs for Low-Income, Minority Groups

We are looking forward to passage of Senate Bill 164, Extended Opportunity Programs and Services for Community College Disadvantaged Students. This legislation would make available approximately $3,000,000 for use by Community Colleges.

In order to be prepared to make best use of these funds, we have asked the Wright Institute in Berkeley to conduct special week-long sessions in various parts of the State for personnel from campuses which conduct or propose to conduct special programs for minority group students. The Institute is directed by Dr. Nevitt Sanford, Professor of Psychology at Stanford University, and conducts research and programs in behavioral problems. The Institute will conduct these sessions in cooperation with us and as a part of the Institute's own on-going training program for college officials which is financed by the U.S. Office of Education.

Sessions will be conducted in the following areas:

Fresno, August 11-15 at Fresno City College
San Francisco, August 25-29 at City College of San Francisco
Los Angeles, September 2-6 at Los Angeles City College
San Diego, September 8-12 at Grossmont College
Sacramento, September 15-19 at the Office of the Chancellor, California Community Colleges, 825 Fifteenth Street

Each session will involve six colleges in the area with six or more persons coming from each college. Persons from each college should include officials in charge of the following responsibilities: admissions, minority student programs, student discipline, counseling, financial aid, curriculum, and personnel hiring. In addition, we would appreciate your including two or more students from each campus who are representative of minority student leadership.

These training sessions are designed to cover material needed by the campuses participating in the expenditure of these funds. Areas to be covered include special student recruiting, admissions and testing, counseling and program planning, summer programs, tutoring, curriculum innovation, student financial aid and fund raising, staff and faculty in-service training, new legislation and application procedures, coordinated campus programs for minority students, and program evaluation.

We regret the short notice involved for these sessions, but this appears to be the most opportune time when such training may take place. At this time also, there is access to some of the most able resource persons in the country who will be part of the program. Training sessions are located in areas where they will have the greatest accessibility to college personnel with a minimum of expense to Community College districts.

If your college wishes to participate in this training, I would appreciate your contacting us immediately, preferably by phone. Dr. Gerald Cresci is coordinating these sessions and would like to know the names of those persons you suggest for such training. Once we hear from you, we will be in contact with you with further details concerning the training program. Dr. Cresci's phone number is (916) 445-0492.

pjl